

### REMARKS

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement is attached herewith.

In the Office Action dated December 15, 2004, claims 1-4, 10-19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over PCT No. WO 01/37510 (Cohen); and claims 5-9, 20, 23 and 24 were rejected under § 103 over Cohen in view of W. Marshall et al., "SIP Extensions For Caller Identity and Privacy," Internet Draft (May 20, 2001) (hereinafter "Marshall").

It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is allowable over Cohen. Claim 1 now recites a storage module to store address and port translation information, a controller to receive a data unit from a first network, the data unit having a source address, a source port, a destination address, and a destination port. The controller is adapted to further translate both the source address and the destination address of the data unit and both the source port and destination port based on the address and port translation information.

The Office Action cited to the translation table depicted in Fig. 4A of Cohen and passages on page 18 of Cohen as disclosing the recited subject matter of claim 1. Fig. 4A shows blocks involved in performing address translation. As described by Cohen, packets entering an "emulation wall" of Fig. 4A have their original addressing translated into a proxy address while in the emulation wall and then have the proxy address translated back into the original address when the datagrams exit the other side of the emulation wall into the emulation subnetwork. Cohen, 17:18-22. Page 18 of Cohen further describes translating an internal source address by an initial proxy system, and then after the translation, further routing the datagram in an internal deception system to a second proxy service, which then translates the source address back to the original source address and the destination address back to the original destination address. Cohen: 18:17-27. There is no teaching in this passage of Cohen of translating both the source address and destination address of a data unit *and both the source port and destination port* of the data unit.

In the rejection of former dependent claim 4 (now cancelled), the Office Action stated that Fig. 4A, and page 18, lines 23-26, of Cohen, teach the translation of the source and destination port. 12/15/2004 Office Action at 3. Fig. 4A of Cohen does provide the following statement: "input is examined using 'promiscuous mode' and a translation table is used to associate each internal address to an external address/port number." However, in the

accompanying description of Fig. 4A, there is no mention of translation of "both the source port and destination port" of the data unit. On page 18 of Cohen, a discussion is made that the second proxy service is able to translate a source address back to the original source address and a destination address back to the original destination address--however, there is no mention of translating both the source and destination address and the source port and destination port of the data unit.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 not anticipated by Cohen.

Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled, without prejudice, to render the rejection of the claims moot. Claim 12 has been amended from dependent form, to independent form, with its scope unchanged. Claim 12 is allowable for reasons similar to those of claim 1.

Amended claim 16 now recites the storing of address translation information, receiving a data unit containing a source address and a destination address, translating both the source and destination addresses based on the address translation information, *partially creating* the address translation information in response to a request to set up a communications session between a first terminal and second terminal, and *completing* the address translation information in response to an acknowledgment message responsive to the request.

There is no teaching by Cohen of partially creating the address translation information in response to a request to set up a communication session, and then completing the address translation information in response to an acknowledgment message responsive to the request.

Marshall, the other reference cited by the Office Action, also does not provide any teaching or suggestion to modify the system of Cohen to achieve the invention of claim 16. Fig. 3 of Marshall shows an anonymizer that "adds a level of indirection thereby hiding the IP address(es) of UA-o from UA-t." Marshall, at 18. Marshall further states that the indirection "is used both for the media streams and SIP signaling, beyond the initial INVITE, exchanged directly between UA-o and UA-t." *Id.* To enable the indirection for other SIP signaling (aside from INVITE) and for the media streams, any address translation information in the anonymizer of Marshall would have to be completed in response to INVITE. Therefore, the partial creation of address translation information in response to a request to set up the communication session

and completion of the address translation information in response to an acknowledgment of the request is not taught or suggested by Marshall.

In view of the foregoing, claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims, including newly added dependent claims 25-29, are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims. Moreover, dependent claims 26 and 28, which depend from claims 1 and 12, respectively, are allowable over the references for reasons similar to those for claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (NRT.0097US).

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 15, 2005

Dan C. Hu  
Registration No. 40,025  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
Telephone: (713) 468-8880  
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883